DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 461 JC 900 311

TITLE	AB 1725 Model Accountability System. California Community Colleges. Revised.
INSTITUTION	California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Board of Governors.
PUB DATE	Jul 90
NOTE	32p.; Discussed as agenda item number 9 at a meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Sacramento, CA, July 12-13, 1990).
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Access to Education; *Accountability; Accreditation (Institutions); Affirmative Action; College Planning; *Community Colleges; Educational Finance; Educational Legislation; Educational Objectives; Government School Relationship; Models; *Outcomes of Education; Participant Satisfaction; School Personnel; Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

This report proposes a model accountability system for the California community colleges to comply with the directives of Assembly Bill 1725 (AB 1725). The purpose of the accountability system is to provide colleges and districts, the board of governors, and the California legislature with information that will allow for the continued improvement of student learning and success. The AB 1725 model accountability system consists of five components: (1) student access, measured in terms of student enrollments and participation rates, programs to promote educational access (e.g., financial aid, basic skills, and articulation programs) and physical facilities; (2) student success, measured in terms of academic standards, course completions, student goal achievement, basic skills and ESL course preparation assessment, noncredit adult education, and accreditation standards; (3) student satisfaction, assessed by surveys of students and accreditation reports on student services and learning resources; (4) staff composition reflective of California's population, and the accomplishment of local affirmative action goals; and (5) fiscal condition, involving comprehensive reporting on revenues and expenditures, the general fund balance, and system-wide costs per full-time equivalency (FTE). The indicators proposed for each of these components will be used to prepare annual system-wide and institutional reports concerning the effectiveness of California's community colleges in achieving their stated mission. Appendixes present AB 1725 model accountability system elements, the AB 1725 accountability task force, and sample reporting forms. (JMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED319461

AB 1725 MODEL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Prepared by the
California Community Colleges
AB 1725 Accountability Task Force

April, 1990
(Revised June, 1990)

IC 900311

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

AB 1725 MODEL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM 9

Second Reading, Action Scheduled

Background

Assembly Bill 1725 (Chapter 973, Statutes of 1988) established the California Community Colleges as the state's third system of public higher education. As a consequence, the Legislature has placed increased demands on the system for accountability. Two essential directives from this statutory mandate are noted below.

> The board of governors shall develop and implement a comprehensive community college educational and fiscal accountability system. [*Education Code* Section 71020.5 (b)]
>
> The chancellor shall provide a written report on the accountability system developed pursuant to this section to the Legislature and Governor on or before July 1, 1990. [*Education Code* Section 71020.5 (d)]

These two charges have framed the work of the AB 1725 Accountability Task Force appointed by the Chancellor. The task force worked during the past several months to develop a report in response to the accountability requirements of AB 1725. A draft of that report was presented to the Board for review and discussion at its May meeting. Since then, it has undergone additional review and revision through field consultation, by several nationally recognized experts, and by the newly established Policy and Performance Outcomes Unit in the Chancellor's Office. The report that follows is presented at this time for Board action.

Analysis

The AB 1725 Model Accountability System consists of five components:

1. **Student Access,**
2. **Student Success,**
3. **Student Satisfaction,**
4. **Staff Composition, and**
5. **Fiscal Condition.**

Specific accountability indicators are proposed for each component. These indicators would be used to develop annual systemwide and institutional accountability reports concerning the effectiveness of California's community colleges in achieving their stated mission. Approval of the proposed Model Accountability System will allow for its continued development during 1990-91 through pilot testing by a limited number of institutions. In addition, the report will be transmitted to the Legislature and the Governor in order to meet the AB 1725 accountability reporting requirement.

Recommended Action

That the Board of Governors approve the report of its AB 1725 Accountability Task Force for transmittal by the Chancellor to the Legislature and the Governor pursuant to the AB 1725 reporting requirement.

Staff Presentation: *Martha Kanter, Assistant Deputy Chancellor*
Policy Development

Mark Fetler, Director
Planning and Performance Outcomes Unit

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
INTRODUCTION		1
A.	Accountability Defined	1
B.	Model Accountability System Development	2
C.	Present Reporting System	2
OVERVIEW OF THE MODEL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM		2
A.	Purpose	2
B.	Principles	3
C.	Scope of the Model Accountability System	3
USES OF THE MODEL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM		4
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MODEL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM		5
A.	Field Test of the Model Accountability System	5
B.	Obtaining Funds for 1991-92 Statewide Implementation	5
COMPONENTS OF THE MODEL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM		5
A.	Student Access	6
B.	Student Success	8
C.	Student Satisfaction	12
D.	Staff Composition	13
E.	Fiscal Condition	14
SUMMARY		17

APPENDICES

Appendix A: AB 1725 Model Accountability System Elements

Appendix B: AB 1725 Accountability Task Force

Appendix C: Sample of Information Provided at Levels 1 Through 3

Appendix D: Sample Formats for Completion Rate Data

INTRODUCTION

Accountability has become, in recent years, a central focus within the public sector of higher education. Numerous state legislatures, executive officers, governing boards, educators, and community representatives have become interested in the concept. A 1989 survey for the National Governors Association found that 36 states had implemented or were considering implementing some form of accountability system.

In 1988, the California Legislature passed AB 1725 (Chapter 973, Statutes of 1988), which mandates that by July 1, 1990, the Board of Governors (BOG) will take steps to implement a comprehensive community college accountability system over a three-year period commencing by the 1991-92 academic year. (See Appendix A for a list of accountability requirements identified in AB 1725.)

This report that follows, prepared by the California Community Colleges AB 1725 Accountability Task Force, proposes a Model Accountability System. The intent of the model is to provide colleges and districts, the Board of Governors, and the Legislature with information that will allow for the continued improvement of student learning and success.

A. Accountability Defined

The dictionary defines accountability as "the condition of being held responsible for one's obligation."

Two important aspects of accountability in public higher education are:

1. specifying one's obligation; and

2. remaining answerable for meeting that obligation.

The first aspect is concerned with illuminating expectations, while the second requires the communication of evidence to document the meeting of obligations. In other words, an accountability system can be used to articulate the aims of leadership and as a management tool for the attainment of those aims.

Various laws, regulations, rules, guidelines, missions, and goals and objectives at the State and local levels describe the obligations of the California Community Colleges and local districts in providing postsecondary education opportunities to the citizens of the state. This model describes the use of indicators to document the system's institutional effectiveness in meeting its postsecondary education obligations.

For the purpose of this model, accountability is operationally defined as:

> The reporting and use of indicators of the California Community Colleges performance in meeting its postsecondary education obligation to the people of the state.

B. Model Accountability System Development

Section 71020.5 of the California Education Code, as enacted by AB 1725, mandates that "the Board of Governors shall develop and implement a comprehensive community college educational and fiscal accountability system," and that "the Chancellor shall provide a written report to the legislature and Governor on or before July 1, 1990."

To implement these charges, the Chancellor established an Accountability Task Force comprised of 31 members. (See Appendix B.)

C. Present Reporting Systems

Various systems now exist for reporting on California's community colleges at the systemwide, district, and individual college levels, and include compliance reviews, fiscal audits, program reviews, and accreditation reports.

The five components of this model can build upon these existing systems and other developing ones, such as the Management Information System (MIS). The comprehensive model contained in this report will replace some of the existing systems, eliminating duplication and, more importantly, providing for the coordinated reporting of all accountability indicators.

OVERVIEW OF THE MODEL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

A. Purpose

The immediate intent of this Model Accountability System is to report information that assesses community college educational and fiscal effectiveness. Its ultimate purpose is to maintain and improve the quality of the institution and enhance the California Community Colleges.

B. Principles

A comprehensive and coordinated Model Accountability System for the California Community Colleges should:

- Coordinate with existing systems for reporting, assessing, and evaluating the performance of institutions;
- Define and employ accountability indicators that acknowledge differences between institutions and the system;
- Assure that indicators used to assess student performance relate directly to teaching and learning processes;
- Relate to the mission statements of the system and individual institutions;
- Enhance student learning and development;
- Reflect institutional differences in community and student demographics;
- Rely primarily on institutional self-assessment and peer review;
- Promote positive incentives for institutional improvement;
- Relate to ongoing institutional accreditation, planning, evaluation, and budget-development activities;
- Promote efficiency in data gathering activities;
- Solicit systemwide consultation in development and implementation; and
- Assure the availability of adequate resources for accountability.

C. Scope

This Model Accountability System contains five major components:

1. Student Access,
2. Student Success,
3. Student Satisfaction,
4. Staff Composition, and

5. Fiscal Condition.

AB 1725 requires the model ". . .to define qualitatively and quantitatively" specific accountability information for each of these five components. Quantitative information is available through existing reports and the Management Information System (MIS). Qualitative information is available through the WASC* accreditation standards and processes, and may need to be expanded for local reporting needs.

The development of the Model Accountability System also rests on the establishment of an effective intersegmental tracking system initiated through the education segments in cooperation with the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

USES OF THE MODEL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

This Model Accountability System will serve as a source of information for the system and local districts to assess their effectiveness, plan their budgets, and develop programs and services.

It is anticipated that the model will be used at three levels.

- *Annual Systemwide Reporting to the Legislature and Other Appropriate Agencies by the Board of Governors and Chancellor*

  It is anticipated that the Board of Governors will use the Model Accountability System for its systemwide strategic planning, policy development, and budget formulation. The information reported at the system level** is also available at the college and district levels.

- *Community College Districts Reporting to the Board of Governors and Chancellor*

  The local districts and colleges already report to the Chancellor's Office for program and compliance reviews, fiscal audits, and accreditation reports. It is anticipated that districts will use the information for local strategic planning, policy development, and budget formulation.

* Western Association of Schools and Colleges/Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. WASC is one of six regional accrediting agencies recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the U.S. Secretary of Education. The Accrediting Commission serves two-year colleges in California, Hawaii, and the Pacific Islands. Standards are from the *1990 Handbook of Accreditation*.

** See Appendix C.

- *Community College Districts and Colleges Reporting to Local Constituencies*

  It is anticipated that local districts and colleges will also use the model to inform their communities on the progress being made in meeting local educational needs.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MODEL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

A. Field Test of the Model Accountability System

The 1990-91 Governor's Budget *Handbook* provides $375,000 in local assistance monies for a pilot test of the Model Accountability System. The purpose is to pilot test the feasibility and usefulness of the model at the local, systemwide, and State levels and to develop and refine indicators, data collection procedures, report formats, dissemination strategies, and planning models. In addition, the pilot test will provide information on the State-mandated costs for districts and colleges of statewide implementation.

During the pilot testing period, the Model Accountability System should be viewed as subject to modification. Experience with the results of the pilot testing and feedback from users may lead to revisions.

B. Obtaining Funds for 1991-92 Statewide Implementation

Statewide implementation of the Model Accountability System is scheduled to begin during the 1991-92 academic year, as required by AB 1725, and be implemented over a three-year period. Implementation is contingent upon securing funding in the 1991-92 Budget Act. The implementation schedule calls for the use of the Management Information System (MIS) to develop most of the data reports envisioned for the accountability system. Task force members have noted the importance of using MIS for accountability-data development, rather than requiring new reporting mechanisms.

COMPONENTS OF THE MODEL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

The five components of the Model Accountability System delineated below reflect high priority areas for the maintenance of success and for improvement in the California Community Colleges. The indicators listed under each component are intended to provide information that can be used by the system and individual institutions to document their success in each of these areas and to plan for improvement. These indicators will help to identify strengths and weaknesses in per-

formance. Strengths can be expanded, and strategies can be developed to eliminate weaknesses.

A. Student Access

Equal opportunity for student access to postsecondary education is a vital concern of the state's community college system. This concern is articulated in AB 1725 and in reports issued by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), the California Community College Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office, and the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, among others.

Many factors facilitate or restrict student access to local colleges. Distance to campus, commuting time, cost of attendance, parking, breadth of curriculum, institutional reputation, and services offered are only a small sample of influences affecting student access. At the policy level is the influence of funding on access. If districts are at or above the cap*, for example, access can be affected negatively. The numbers of courses and sections offered by a college and the minimum class size required to offer a course are affected by funding.

The task force has identified the following indicators of student access:

1. Student Enrollments and Participation Rates

a. Using multiple-year comparative enrollment statistics from MIS and demographic data, the following list of participation rates and headcount enrollments are proposed:

(1) Gender

(2) Age Categories

(3) Ethnicity

(4) Disability

(5) Full-Time, Part-Time and Noncredit Enrollment Status

(6) Average Hour Loads

(7) Within District, Out-of-District, Out-of-State Enrollment

* Level of unfunded student enrollment

(8) Headcount Enrollment in Credit Courses Compared to Adult Population Aggregated at State Level

(9) Headcount Enrollment in Credit Courses Compared to Adult Population Demographic Characteristics (i.e., Gender, Age, Ethnicity, Zip Code Aggregated by Income) Aggregated at State Level

(10) Results of CPEC College-Going Rates Study

(11) Numbers of Hours Worked By Students Per Week

(12) Total Unduplicated Headcount

(13) Total Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES)

(14) Enrollment Projections*

(15) Enrollment by Zip Code Aggregated by Income*

b. Enrollment vs. Cap

(1) Number and Percentage of Districts Above Cap

(2) Number of Students (FTES) Above Cap

2. *Access Programs*

a. Financial Aid (Annual Reporting)

(1) Number and Percentage of Students who Request and Receive Financial Aid by Selected Student Characteristics

(2) Dollar Amount of Need-Based Aid Provided by Major Aid Category

(3) Dollar Amount of Unmet Need

b. English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) and Basic Skill Course Offerings (Credit and Noncredit)

(1) Number and Percentage of Students (FTES and Headcount) Enrolled in ESL courses

* From census or other population data

(2) Number and Percentage of Students (FTES and Headcount) Enrolled in Basic Skills Courses

c. Categorical Programs Designed to Increase Student Access (e.g., EOPS, DSP&S, GAIN, Matriculation)

(1) Listing and Description of Special Categorical Programs Offered to Increase Student Access

(2) Number of Students (Headcount) Using Program Services

d. Articulation

(1) Number and Type (System, School, Program, and Course) of Articulation Agreements with Secondary Schools and with Four-Year Institutions

(2) Qualitative Measure – WASC Accreditation Standard 2C: Articulation

3. Physical Facilities

a. Amount of Dollars Spent on Physical Facility Improvements For Disabled Student Access vs. Dollars Needed

b. Qualitative Measure – WASC Accreditation Standard 6A: Facilities

Additional student access indicators should be investigated for inclusion in the system. The use of indicators such as the following may later be considered feasible and appropriate to include within the Student Access Component of the Model Accountability System: census data, outreach and recruitment activities, periodic statewide surveys of students' social/economic status, facility needs based on revised utilization standards, program-based funding standards as they influence average class size and class size minimums, number of class sections canceled due to enrollments below minimum standards, and numbers of secondary school graduates eligible and not eligible for UC and CSU enrollment who enroll in community colleges.

B. Student Success

The success of students is the foremost goal of faculty and staff of the California Community Colleges. The concept of student success is complex. Institutional efforts to help students learn are but one side of the equation. Student preparation, motivation, responsibility, involvement, readiness, and effort are also pertinent factors that influence student success. The road to success is a

shared journey by colleges and students. Historically, outcome measures of student success have overemphasized the institutional commitment at the expense of social and demographic influences that are not easily dealt with by policymakers, administrators, and faculty.

Elements within this component contain indicators of institutional and student commitment and effort to success.

1. *Academic Standards*

    a. Number and Percentage of Existing Courses Meeting Title 5 Requirements Reviewed and Revised

    b. Number of New Courses Meeting Title 5 Requirements

    c. Qualitative Measure – Statement of Curriculum Committee Involvement in Course Approval and Revision Process

    d. Qualitative Measure – Narrative Description of Program Review Activities

    e. Qualitative Measure – WASC Accreditation

        (1) Standard 2B: General Education

        (2) Standard 2D: Curriculum Planning and Evaluation

        (3) Standard 2E: Noncredit Courses and Programs

        (4) Standard 2G: Credit for Student Achievement

2. *Course Completions (Excludes "F," "W" and Noncredit)*

    a. Completion Rates of Students (Headcount) by Discipline and Credit Level From First Census to Receipt of a Final Grade (Transfer/General Education, Vocational/Technical, Precollegiate Basic Skills, etc.)*

    b. Completion Rates of Students by Title 5 Course Level*

* See Sample Format in Appendix D.

3. *Student Goal Achievement (from Matriculation Process)*

a. Transfer Goal*

(1) Number and Percentage of Students Identifying "Transfer" as a Matriculation Goal

(2) Number of Students Who Transfer to a Senior Institution

(3) Transfer Rate for "Probable Transfer Students"

(4) GPAs of Transfer Students at Senior Institutions After One Semester and After One Year

(5) Number and Percentage of Transfer Students Completing Precollegiate Courses

(6) Number and Percentage of Students Transferring to Another California Community College

(7) Number and Percentage of Transfer Students Completing Baccalaureate Degrees

b. Vocational Preparation Goal**

(1) Number and Percentage of Students Identifying "Vocational Preparation" as a Matriculation Goal

(2) Number and Percentage of Students Completing a Certificate or Degree

(3) Employment Status of Program Completers and Non-Completers (Number and Percentage)

(4) College Attendance Status of Program Completers and Non-Completers (Number and Percentage)

(5) Employment Status Relationship to Training For Program Completers and Non-Completers (Number and Percentage)

(6) Pass Rate of Completers on Licensing and Accrediting Examination by Vocational/Technical Program

* The task force suggests that a number of transfer-rate formulas be evaluated as part of the Model Accountability System field test.

** Elements (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (7), and (8) derived from the Statewide Student Follow-up System.

(7) Degree of Employer Satisfaction With Preparation of Program Completer

(8) (1) – (5) Categorized by Student Characteristics

c. Personal Development Goals

(1) Number and Percentage of Students (FTES and Headcount) Meeting Selected Goals Identified in the Matriculation Process

(2) Number and Percentage of Students (FTES and Headcount) Meeting Selected Goals Identified in Matriculation Process by Student Demographic Characteristics (i.e., Age, Gender, Ethnicity)

4. *Basic Skills and ESL Course Preparation Assessment*

a. Number, Percentage, GPA, and Completion Rates of Basic Skills Students, ESL Students, Direct Entry Students, and Total Students by Academic Standard Classification and Student Characteristics

5. *Noncredit (Adult Education)*

a. Number and percentage of students enrolled in the nine authorized instruction areas.

b. Number and percentage of students enrolled in the nine authorized instruction areas by student demographic characteristics.

c. Qualitative Measure – WASC Accreditation Standard 2E: Noncredit Courses and Programs

6. *Qualitative Measures – WASC Accreditation Report for the Following Standards*

a. Standard 1: Institutional Integrity, Purposes, Planning and Effectiveness

(1) 1C: Institutional Planning

(2) 1D: Institutional Effectiveness

b. Standard 2: Educational Programs.

(1) 2A: General Requirements

C. Student Satisfaction

An essential measure of institutional effectiveness is the student's satisfaction as a consumer of educational programs and services.

Since community colleges in California are locally based and governed institutions and the consumers generally continue to reside in their home communities upon completing their education, their satisfaction is important to continued support for local community colleges.

The elements in this component focus on measures of student-goal satisfaction and qualitative results of accreditation visits. Standard statewide surveys, administered to a representative sample of community college students, will be needed to provide certain types of information. Local districts will add additional questions to provide supplemental information.

1. *Student Satisfaction Surveys*

    a. Satisfaction with progress toward obtaining educational goal

    b. Satisfaction with processes and services used to achieve goal, i.e.:

        (1) Instruction

        (2) Instructional Services

        (3) Student Services

        (4) Facilities

        (5) Governance/Administration

2. *Qualitative Measures – WASC Accreditation Report*

    a. Standard 3: Student Services and the Co-Curricular Learning Environment

        (1) 3A: General Provisions

        (2) 3B: Counseling Services

        (3) 3C: Admissions and Records

        (4) 3D: Coordination and Administration

        (5) 3E: Comprehensiveness of Services

b. Standard 5: Learning Resources

(1) 5A: General Provisions

(2) 5C: Accessibility

D. Staff Composition

Enhancing the diversity of community college staff is important, especially in light of the rapidly changing demographic characteristics of California's population. Statewide hiring results need to be put into proper perspective by considering the numbers and percentages of faculty and staff hired within each of the EEO-6 job categories (Equal Employment Opportunity Act, Section 6) by ethnicity, gender, age, and disability compared with the general availability of these groups in the relevant work force having requisite skills to fill vacancies.

Improvement in staff diversity requires not only an intent and commitment, but the proper internal mechanisms and procedures to conduct a search, screen and interview candidates, and negotiate an offer.

1. *Numbers and Percentage of Present Staff Compared to Available Work Force in the State by Gender, Age, Disability, and Ethnicity Using EEO-6 Categories*

   a. Executive – Administrative – Managerial

   b. Faculty (Full- and Part-Time)

   c. Professional Non-Faculty

   d. Clerical – Secretarial

   e. Service – Maintenance

   f. Technical – Paraprofessional

   g. Skilled Crafts

2. *Recent Hires (last 3 years) Compared to Available Work Force in the State by Gender, Age, Disability, and Ethnicity using EEO-6 Categories*

3. *Accomplishment of Local Affirmative Action Goals and Timetables*

Annual progress report toward affirmative action goals and timetables established by local districts reported to the Chancellor's Office.

4. *Qualitative Measure – WASC Accreditation Report*

Standard 4: Faculty and Staff

E. Fiscal Condition

The Fiscal Condition component will inform the public how the community colleges expend their financial resources and about the overall fiscal condition of the community college system. It provides the Board of Governors with fiscal information related to various mandated reporting requirements.

The Chancellor's Office conducts a number of activities related to fiscal accountability. The recently created Fiscal and Program Standards Accountability Unit (F&PSA) is comprised of three major areas; (1) Audit Resolution, (2) Vocational Education Act (VEA) Audits, and (3) Student Services Program Compliance Reviews. The Unit focuses on reviewing community college programs, including Vocational Education (VEA), Extended Opportunities Programs and Services (EOPS), Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSP&S), and Board Financial Aid Programs (BFAP). This review is accomplished through a three-step procedure of: (1) Field Visit Preparation; (2) Site Visit, and (3) Report Delivery and Resolution.

The Chancellor's Office has a system for monitoring and evaluating the financial conditions of the state's community college districts. Developed in response to AB 2910, the system is an early detection and prevention process to "stabilize the financial condition of the district before an emergency appropriation is necessary" (Education Code, Section 84046). This charge is accomplished by a quarterly financial reporting system, and by taking appropriate and timely follow-up action to bring about improvement in the district's financial condition. The financial condition of a district is assessed by a review of (1) General Fund Balance (current, historical, and projected); (2) Spending Patterns (current, historical, and projected); (3) Average Daily Attendance (ADA) (patterns related to statewide trends and potential impact on revenue); and (4) Other Factors (includes "going concern", as defined by AB 2910; audit citings; and internal control audit citings). While a number of instruments and sources of information are used to provide a composite picture of each district's financial condition, the Quarterly Financial Status Report (CCFS-311Q) and the Annual Financial Budget Report (CCFS-311), submitted by each district, are major reporting systems used by the Chancellor's Office. At least one other State agency, the Department of Finance, monitors some aspects of community

college financial matters. The Department of Finance now audits about 20 districts a year.

Fiscal accountability activities, also, are undertaken by local community college districts on a routine basis. District-contracted audits are conducted yearly by independent auditing firms. The Annual Audit Guide, prepared by the Chancellor's Office, assists local districts to prepare and contract for this independent audit. Audit results are available for public scrutiny.

This Fiscal Condition component is a comprehensive reporting of the financial condition of the state's system of community colleges. It includes:

1. *Restricted Purpose Revenues and Expenditures*
    a. Lottery
    b. Instructional Equipment
    c. Program Equipment
    d. Staff Diversity
    e. Staff Development
    f. Capital Construction
    g. Categorical Programs
2. *General Revenue*
    a. Revenue Type
        (1) Apportionment
        (2) Property Tax
        (3) Student Fees
        (4) Earned Interest
        (5) Other

3. *Expenditures*
    a. Expenditure Type
        (1) Professional Staff Salaries (1000)
        (2) Classified Staff Salaries (2000)
        (3) Fringe Benefits (3000)
        (4) Supplies (4000)
        (5) Contractual Services (5000)
        (6) Capital Outlay (6000)
4. *Related Fiscal Indicators*
    a. Compliance With 50 Percent Law
    b. Cap
        (1) Above Cap
5. *District Audit Results (Summary Data)*
6. *General Fund Balance*
    a. Number of Districts With a Positive Balance
    b. Percentage of Districts With a Positive Balance
    c. Percentage of Budget Represented As Fund Balance
7. *Aggregate and Average Cost Per FTES Systemwide*
8. *Program-Based Funding (Percent of Standards Funded This Year)*
9. *Qualitative Measure – WASC Accreditation Standard 7: Financial Resources*

SUMMARY

The AB 1725 Model Accountability System is intended as a tool to help identify the educational and fiscal strengths and weaknesses of the community college system, with the goals of improved student success and performance. The model contain five components: (1) Student Access, (2) Student Success, (3) Student Satisfaction, (4) Staff Composition, and (5) Fiscal Condition. The indicators proposed for each of these components will be used to prepare annual systemwide and institutional reports concerning the effectiveness of California's Community Colleges in achieving their stated mission. If approved, the proposed model will be used during 1990-91 pilot testing with a limited number of institutions. Results from the pilot testing will be used to modify the model where necessary and to develop costs for statewide implementation.

APPENDIX A

AB 1725 Model Accountability System Elements

Assembly Bill 1725 requires the Board of Governors to develop and recommend (by July 1990) implementation of a comprehensive community college educational and fiscal accountability system (*Education Code* Section 710020.5). The legislation outlines major elements of the Model Accountability System requested by the Legislature, including quantitative and qualitative measures in the following areas:

A. Student access to community colleges

B. Extent to which the community college student body reflects proportionately the adult population of the state

C. Student transfer rates and programs

D. Academic standards and student achievement

E. Student goal satisfaction and success in courses and programs

F. Completion rates of courses and programs

G. Occupational preparation relative to state and local work force needs and for entry-level employment, occupational advancement, and career changes of students

H. Adequacy of basic skills and English-as-a-Second Language courses and instruction in preparing students to succeed in collegiate level work

I. Adequacy of and student satisfaction with student services

J. Extent to which the community college work force reflects proportionately the adult population of the state

K. Fiscal conditions of community college districts

APPENDIX B

AB 1725 Accountability Task Force

Representation

The task force members represented the following groups:

- Chief Executive Officers
- Chief Instructional Officers
- Chief Student Services Officers
- Chief Business Officers
- Chief Information System Officers
- Institutional Researchers
- Human Resource Officers
- Faculty
- Trustees
- Accrediting Commission
- Chancellor's Office

Task Force Officers and Members

Co-Chairpersons: Jack Carhart, Contra Costa CCD
Ted Hamilton, Modesto Junior College

Project Director: Ray Giles, Rancho Santiago College

Project Consultant: Bill Piland, San Diego State University

Members:

Wilfred Desrosiers, College of Marin
Richard Green, Pasadena City College
Bill Hamre, CCC Chancellor's Office
Cecil Harrell, Peralta CCD
Michael Hill, San Jose/Evergreen CCD
Marty Hittleman, Los Angeles CCD
Robert Jensen, Rancho Santiago CCD
Charlotte Joseph, Long Beach City College
Martha Kanter, CCC Chancellor's Office
Jake Konen, Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCD
Jim Locke, College of Marin
John McCuen, CCCT
Carol McKenzie, Sacramento City College
Cheryl Miller, Citrus CCD
Jim Mitchell, San Francisco CCD
Jan Moser, Palomar College
Rod Patterson, Los Angeles
Marie Pepicello, San Joaquin Delta College
John Petersen, ACCJC
Jorge R. Sanchez, Coast CCD
Charles K. Sapper, Diablo Valley College
Bob Scannell, Peralta CCD
Bill F. Stewart, State Center CCD
John Woolley, Ventura College

Brief History

The AB 1725 Accountability Task Force received its charge from the Chancellor at its initial meeting on November 10, 1989. At that meeting the task force divided into three major sub-groups. These groups were organized around accountability issues concerned with the areas of: (1) fiscal; (2) instruction; and (3) student services. The instruction and student services groups further divided into northern and southern contingents. These groups held meetings and conference telephone calls to develop the various model components. The results of their work provided input to the task force.

The task force met on December 14, 1989, January 16, February 13, and April 10, 1990. During that period, a small writing team was established to take the input of the task force sub-groups and prepare the actual accountability model. The products provided by the writing team were reviewed and revised by the task force.

As the model system was being created, task force members shared information and received input from their respective constituencies. This sharing of information occurred at statewide and regional meetings of various groups and through informal contacts with those constituencies.

The task force held two public hearings to obtain input from the field. These hearings were conducted at Rancho Santiago College in Santa Ana on March 23, 1990, and at the College of San Mateo in San Mateo on March 30, 1990. They were attended by community college faculty, administrators, support staff, students, and other interested parties.

The Model Accountability System was introduced into Consultation, which included review by the following councils: Chief Executive Officers; Academic Senate; Student Body Government; Instructional Officers; Student Services Officers; Business Officers and the Council of Organizations. The representatives of these councils shared the model with their respective groups and provided feedback to the Chancellor.

APPENDIX C

LEVEL 1: Chancellor to Legislature/Other Agencies

A. Restricted Purpose Revenues and Expenditures

Year _____

Revenue Type Amount		Total Revenue Amount	Total Expenditure
1.	Lottery		
2.	Instructional Equipment		
3.	Program Equipment		
4.	Staff Diversity		
5.	Staff Development		
6.	Capital Construction		
7.	Categorical Programs	_____	_____
	TOTALS:		

B. GENERAL REVENUE

Year ____

REVENUE TYPE	TOTAL REVENUE RECEIVED
1. Apportionment	
2. Property Tax	
3. Student Fees	
4. Earned Interest	
5. Other	_____
TOTAL:	

C. EXPENDITURES

Year _____

EXPENDITURE TYPE	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
1. Professional Staff Salaries (1000)	
2. Classified Staff Salaries (2000)	
3. Fringe Benefits (3000)	
4. Supplies (4000)	
5. Contractual Services (5000)	
6. Capital Outlay (6000)	_____
TOTAL:	

D. RELATED FISCAL MEASURES

Year _____

	MEASURES	**NO. OF DISTRICTS**	**% OF DISTRICTS**
1.	Compliance With the 50% Las		
2.	CAP		
	a. Above CAP		

E. DISTRICT AUDIT RESULTS (SUMMARY DATA)

F. GENERAL FUND BALANCE*

Year _____

NO. OF DISTRICTS WITH POSITIVE BALANCE	**% OF DISTRICTS WITH POSITIVE BALANCE**	**% OF BUDGET REPRESENTED AS FUND BALANCE**

* General fund balance as defined by fiscal monitoring system (AB 2810, Ed. Code 84046)

G. AGGREGATE AND AVERAGE COST PER FTES SYSTEMWIDE*

These figures are derived by calculating total costs of education for the community college system. This figure then is divided by the system total FTES to produce an average cost per FTES.

LEVEL 2: DISTRICT TO CHANCELLOR

A. Examples of Data Reported to Meet Requirements of the Chancellor's Office

1. Fiscal Report (e.g. 311, Quarterly and Annually)
2. Student Attendance Accounting Reporting (e.g. 320)
3. Audit Financial Reports
4. Categorical Data Reports
5. Staff Data Reports

B. Examples of Information Districts May Want to Provide to the Chancellor's Office

1. Cost of Accountability
2. Statement of Special Situations Impacting Fiscal Conditions of Individual Districts (i.e., Size, Location, Campus(e) Age, Student Population Mix, Educational Program Mix, etc.)

LEVEL 3: DISTRICT TO LOCAL CONSTITUENCIES

A. Examples of Important Information to Report

1. Financial Statement for the District (narrative form)
2. Revenue Mix (amounts and percentage)
3. Ending Balances by Fund
4. Budget and Actual Revenue and Expense Comparisons by Major Categories (restricted and non-restricted)

B. Examples of Desirable Information to Report

1. Student Costs to Attend District
2. Fiscal Data to Facilitate Collective Bargaining
3. District Financial Procedures

---

* Credit and non-credit considerations should be discussed in the consultation process since some districts conduct non-credit educational experiences while others do not.

APPENDIX D

Sample Format

PERCENT COMPLETION RATES BY DISCIPLINE AND STUDENT TYPE

	Precollegiate Basic Skills	English-As-A Second language	Direct Entry	AA Students
Business				
Engineering				
Health Sciences				
Humanities				

Sample Format

PERCENT COMPLETION RATES
by
ACADEMIC STANDARD CLASSIFICATION AND DISCIPLINE

	Business	Engineering	Health Sciences	Humanities
Baccalaureate Degree-Applicable (Transferable Credit Course)				
AA/AS Degree-Applicable (Non-Transferable Credit Course)				
Non-Degree Applicable (Credit Course)				
Non-Credit				

Sample Format

PERCENT COMPLETION RATES BY ACADEMIC STANDARD CLASSIFICATION AND STUDENT TYPE

	Precollegiate Basic Skills	English-As-A Second language	Direct Entry	ALL Students
Baccalaureate Degree-Applicable (Transferable Credit Course)				
AA/AS Degree-Applicable (Non-Transferable Credit Course)				
Non-Degree Applicable (Credit Course)				
Non-Credit				

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges JUL 12 1990